

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
STATESBORO DIVISION**

ALVIN ANTONIO DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

STANLEY WILLIAMS; MR. KILLGONE;  
MRS. WEST; MRS. MAGAHEE; MRS.  
KAY; and MR. FLOWERS,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 6:15-cv-144

**ORDER and MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff, who is currently housed at Georgia State Prison in Reidsville, Georgia, submitted a Complaint in the above-captioned action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. 1.) For the reasons set forth below, Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies before filing this lawsuit. Consequently, I **RECOMMEND** that the Court **DISMISS** this action **WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and **DENY** Plaintiff leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court notified Plaintiff of the requirement that he have exhausted all administrative remedies in its Order of February 2, 2016. (Doc. 4, p. 2.) Moreover, the Court provided Plaintiff with the opportunity to dismiss his action at that time and notified him that, if the Court dismissed his action for failure to exhaust, he would still be responsible for paying the full filing fee. *Id.* A “district court can only dismiss an action on its own motion as long as the procedure employed is fair. . . . To employ fair procedure, a district court must generally provide the plaintiff with notice of its intent to dismiss or an opportunity to respond.” *Tazoe v. Airbus S.A.S.*, 631 F.3d 1321, 1336 (11th Cir. 2011) (citations and internal quotations marks omitted). A Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) provides such notice and opportunity to respond. *See Shivers v. Int’l Bhd. of Elec. Workers Local Union 349*, 262 F. App’x 121, 125, 127 (11th Cir. 2008) (indicating that a party has notice of a district court’s intent to *sua sponte* grant summary judgment where a magistrate judge issues a report recommending the *sua sponte* granting of summary judgment); *Anderson v. Dunbar Armored, Inc.*, 678 F. Supp. 2d 1280, 1296 (N.D. Ga. 2009) (noting that R&R served as notice that claims would be *sua sponte* dismissed). This Report and Recommendation constitutes fair notice to Plaintiff that his suit is barred and due to be dismissed. As indicated below, Plaintiff will have the opportunity to present his objections to this finding, and the District Court will review *de novo* properly submitted objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ.

## BACKGROUND<sup>2</sup>

Plaintiff has been housed in Georgia State Prison since 2015. (Doc. 1, p. 12.) Plaintiff is transgender and suffers from mental illnesses. Id. In July of 2015, Plaintiff attempted suicide on two occasions. Id. Defendant Mrs. Magahee, who Plaintiff identifies as either a nurse practitioner or physician's assistant, saw Plaintiff in the prison's medical unit on July 17, 2015, August 6, 2015, and September 15, 2015. (Id. at pp. 12–13.) On each of those occasions, Plaintiff voiced concerns to Defendant Magahee regarding his medical treatment. Id. Specifically, Plaintiff requested that he be given medications for his mental health illnesses and his hormone therapy which he had previously been prescribed. Id. Additionally, he raised concerns with Ms. Magahee and the prison's mental health review committee regarding the fact that he was classified as Level II mental health patient when he had previously been classified as a Level III patient in the State of Florida prison system. Id. Plaintiff also takes issue with the loss of three of his sports bras during his transfer to a strip cell after one of his suicide attempts. Id.

Plaintiff filed two grievances on July 18, 2015. The first concerned the loss of his sports bras, and in the second, he grieved his complaints regarding his mental health treatment and his lack of hormone therapy. (Id. at pp. 2, 14.) As of October 16, 2015, the date that Plaintiff signed his Complaint, he had not received a response to either grievance. Id.

---

P. 72; see also Glover v. Williams, No. 1:12-CV-3562-TWT-JFK, 2012 WL 5930633, at \*1 (N.D. Ga. Oct. 18, 2012) (explaining that magistrate judge's report and recommendation constituted adequate notice and petitioner's opportunity to file objections provided a reasonable opportunity to respond).

<sup>2</sup> The Court draws the following facts from Plaintiff's Complaint and accepts them as true, as it must at this stage.

## STANDARD OF REVIEW

Plaintiff seeks to bring this action *in forma pauperis* under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), the Court may authorize the filing of a civil lawsuit without the prepayment of fees if the plaintiff submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all of his assets and shows an inability to pay the filing fee and also includes a statement of the nature of the action which shows that he is entitled to redress. Even if the plaintiff proves indigence, the Court must dismiss the action if it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)–(ii). Additionally, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the Court must review a complaint in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity. Upon such screening, the Court must dismiss a complaint, or any portion thereof, that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or which seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

When reviewing a Complaint on an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court is guided by the instructions for pleading contained in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 (“A pleading that states a claim for relief must contain [among other things] . . . a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 10 (requiring that claims be set forth in numbered paragraphs, each limited to a single set of circumstances). Further, a claim is frivolous under Section 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) “if it is ‘without arguable merit either in law or fact.’” Napier v. Preslicka, 314 F.3d 528, 531 (11th Cir. 2002) (quoting Bilal v. Driver, 251 F.3d 1346, 1349 (11th Cir. 2001)).

Whether a complaint fails to state a claim under Section 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) is governed by the same standard applicable to motions to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). Thompson v. Rundle, 393 F. App’x 675, 678 (11th Cir. 2010). Under that

standard, this Court must determine whether the complaint contains “sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A plaintiff must assert “more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not” suffice. Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555. Section 1915 also “accords judges not only the authority to dismiss a claim based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless.” Bilal, 251 F.3d at 1349 (quoting Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989)).

In its analysis, the Court will abide by the long-standing principle that the pleadings of unrepresented parties are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys and, therefore, must be liberally construed. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); Boxer X v. Harris, 437 F.3d 1107, 1110 (11th Cir. 2006) (“*Pro se* pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than pleadings drafted by attorneys.”) (emphasis omitted) (quoting Hughes v. Lott, 350 F.3d 1157, 1160 (11th Cir. 2003)). However, Plaintiff’s unrepresented status will not excuse mistakes regarding procedural rules. McNeil v. United States, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993) (“We have never suggested that procedural rules in ordinary civil litigation should be interpreted so as to excuse mistakes by those who proceed without counsel.”). The requisite review of Plaintiff’s Complaint raises several doctrines of law, which the Court discusses as follows.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **I. Dismissal for Failure to Exhaust Administrative Remedies**

Where Congress explicitly mandates, prisoners seeking relief for alleged constitutional violations must first exhaust inmate grievance procedures before filing suit in federal court. See Porter v. Nussle, 534 U.S. 516, 524 (2002). Section 1997e(a) of Title 42 of the United States

Code states, “No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1983 of this title, or any other Federal law . . . until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.” In Porter, the United States Supreme Court held that exhaustion of available administrative remedies is mandatory. 534 U.S. at 523; see also O’Brien v. United States, 137 F. App’x 295, 301–02 (11th Cir. 2005) (finding lack of exhaustion where prisoner “prematurely filed his civil complaint . . . and . . . ‘failed to heed that clear statutory command’ requiring that his administrative remedies be exhausted before bringing suit”).

The requirement that a prisoner exhaust his remedies “first in an agency setting allows ‘the agency [to] develop the necessary factual background upon which decisions should be based’ and giv[es] ‘the agency a chance to discover and correct its own errors.’” Green v. Sec’y for Dep’t of Corr., 212 F. App’x 869, 871 (11th Cir. 2006) (quoting Alexander v. Hawk, 159 F.3d 1321, 1327 (11th Cir. 1998) (first alteration in original)). Furthermore, requiring exhaustion “eliminate[s] unwarranted federal-court interference with the administration of prisons” and allows “corrections officials time and opportunity to address complaints internally before allowing the initiation of a federal case.” Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 93 (2006).

The Supreme Court has noted that exhaustion must be “proper.” Id. at 92. “Proper exhaustion demands compliance with an agency’s deadlines and other critical procedural rules because no adjudicative system can function effectively without imposing some orderly structure on the course of its proceedings.” Id. at 90–91. In other words, an institution’s requirements define what is considered exhaustion. Jones v. Bock, 549 U.S. 199, 218 (2007). Thus, under the law, prisoners must do more than simply initiate grievances; they must also appeal any denial of relief through all levels of review that comprise the administrative grievance process. Bryant v. Rich, 530 F.3d 1368, 1378 (11th Cir. 2008) (“To exhaust administrative remedies in accordance

with the PLRA, prisoners must ‘properly take each step within the administrative process.’”) (quoting Johnson v. Meadows, 418 F.3d 1152, 1157 (11th Cir. 2005)); Sewell v. Ramsey, No. CV406-159, 2007 WL 201269 (S.D. Ga. Jan. 27, 2007) (finding that a plaintiff who is still awaiting a response from the warden regarding his grievance is still in the process of exhausting his administrative remedies).

Furthermore, an inmate who files an untimely grievance or simply spurns the administrative process until it is no longer available fails to satisfy the exhaustion requirement of the PLRA. Johnson, 418 F.3d at 1157–59; Higginbottom v. Carter, 223 F.3d 1259, 1261 (11th Cir. 2000) (inmate’s belief that administrative procedures are futile or needless does not excuse the exhaustion requirement). Additionally, “[t]he only facts pertinent to determining whether a prisoner has satisfied the PLRA’s exhaustion requirement are those that existed when he filed his original complaint.” Smith v. Terry, 491 F. App’x 81, 83 (11th Cir. 2012).

Within the Georgia Department of Corrections, the grievance procedure is a two-step process. See Shaw v. Toole, No. 6:14-CV-48, 2015 WL 4529817, at \*5 (S.D. Ga. July 27, 2015), *report and recommendation adopted*, No. CV 614-048, 2015 WL 5025478 (S.D. Ga. Aug. 24, 2015) (citing Georgia Department of Corrections’ Standard Operating Procedure IIB05–0001 (“SOP IIB05–0001”)). The process commences with the filing of a grievance, which must be filed within ten calendar days from “the date the offender knew, or should have known, of the facts giving rise to the grievance.” Id. The Grievance Coordinator is to screen the grievance to determine whether the warden should accept the grievance or reject it. Id. The warden has a period of forty (40) calendar days from the date the inmate gave his grievance to the counselor to respond. An extension of ten (10) calendar days can be granted once, provided the inmate is advised in writing of the extension before the original 40 calendar days have

expired. Id. An inmate can file an appeal with the Commissioner's Office in the following instances: if the grievance coordinator rejects his original grievance; after the warden responds to the original grievance; or when the time allowed for the warden's decision has expired. The inmate has seven (7) calendar days in which to file this appeal. Id. The Commissioner has 100 calendar days after receipt to render a decision. These time limits may be waived for good cause. Id.

Failure to exhaust administrative remedies is an affirmative defense and inmates are not required to specially plead or demonstrate exhaustion in their complaint. Jones, 549 U.S. at 216. However, the normal pleading rules still apply, and when an affirmative defense appears on the face of a complaint making it clear that a prisoner cannot state a claim for relief, dismissal is warranted under the screening process set out in 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Id. at 214–15. Thus, when a prisoner admits in his complaint that he has not exhausted the grievance process, dismissal is warranted. See Okpala v. Drew, 248 F. App'x 72 (11th Cir. 2007); Cole v. Ellis, No. 5:10-CV-00316-RS-GRJ, 2010 WL 5564632, at \*3 (N.D. Fla. Dec. 28, 2010); Rashid v. Liberty Cty. Jail, CV410-092, 2010 WL 3239241, at \*1 n.1 (S.D. Ga. May 3, 2010) (“Nothing in Jones . . . forbids the Court from dismissing a complaint pursuant to § 1997e(a) if it is clear from the face of the complaint that the prisoner has not exhausted all administrative remedies available to him.”).

It is apparent from the face of Plaintiff's Complaint that he did not exhaust his available administrative remedies prior to filing this lawsuit. Plaintiff signed his Complaint on November 1, 2015, (doc. 1, p. 14), and it was filed in this Court on December 14, 2015. The form Plaintiff used to file his Complaint asked what steps Plaintiff took to exhaust his administrative remedies. (Doc. 1, p. 2.) Plaintiff only stated that he filed two grievances and that he never received a response. Id. Plaintiff did not make any mention of filing an appeal after the lack of response or

any other action. Later in his Complaint, Plaintiff stated that he filed his two grievances on July 18, 2015, and that he had not received a response as of October 16, 2015. (Id. at p. 14.) He further stated that the Warden was required to respond to his grievance within forty days of its filing. Id.

From the face of Plaintiff's Complaint, it is clear that he did not file an appeal with the Commissioner's Office after not receiving a response to his grievance. Again, SOP IIB05-0001 provided for Plaintiff to file an appeal with the Commissioner's Office after the warden failed to respond to Plaintiff's grievance. Plaintiff could file this appeal within seven calendar days of the expiration of the warden's time to issue a decision. Accordingly, the warden's failure to respond to Plaintiff's grievance did not excuse Plaintiff from further pursuit of his administrative remedies. Bettencourt v. Owens, 542 F. App'x 730, 734 (11th Cir. 2013) ("Despite [the plaintiff's] protestations to the contrary, when the warden failed to respond to the formal grievance within the allotted thirty-day period [the plaintiff] was required to pursue an appeal in order to exhaust his claim."); Milton v. Fleckenstein, No. 6:10-CV-377, 2011 WL 208310, at \*1 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 21, 2011) ("although Plaintiff never received responses to his formal grievances, grievances must be pursued through to the final level, even where no response is received."). Furthermore, even if Plaintiff had filed an appeal, the 100 days for the Commissioner's Office to respond to that appeal would not have expired by the time Plaintiff signed this lawsuit on November 1, 2015.

For these reasons, Plaintiff has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. Consequently, I **RECOMMEND** that the Court **DISMISS** this action **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.



## II. Leave to Appeal *In Forma Pauperis*

The Court should also deny Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.<sup>3</sup> Though Plaintiff has, of course, not yet filed a notice of appeal, it would be appropriate to address these issues in the Court's order of dismissal. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3) (trial court may certify that appeal is not taken in good faith "before or after the notice of appeal is filed").

An appeal cannot be taken *in forma pauperis* if the trial court certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). Good faith in this context must be judged by an objective standard. Busch v. Cty. of Volusia, 189 F.R.D. 687, 691 (M.D. Fla. 1999). A party does not proceed in good faith when he seeks to advance a frivolous claim or argument. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). A claim or argument is frivolous when it appears the factual allegations are clearly baseless or the legal theories are indisputably meritless. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989); Carroll v. Gross, 984 F.2d 392, 393 (11th Cir. 1993). Or, stated another way, an *in forma pauperis* action is frivolous and, thus, not brought in good faith, if it is "without arguable merit either in law or fact." Napier v. Preslicka, 314 F.3d 528, 531 (11th Cir. 2002); see also Brown v. United States, Nos. 407CV085, 403CR001, 2009 WL 307872, at \*1–2 (S.D. Ga. Feb. 9, 2009).

Based on the above analysis of Plaintiff's action, there are no non-frivolous issues to raise on appeal, and an appeal would not be taken in good faith. Thus, the Court should **DENY** Plaintiff *in forma pauperis* status on appeal.

## CONCLUSION

For the numerous reasons set forth above, I **RECOMMEND** that the Court **DISMISS** this action **WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for failure to exhaust administrative remedies, **DENY** Plaintiff's Motion to Consolidate, and **DENY** Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

---

<sup>3</sup> A certificate of appealability is not required in this Section 1983 action.

The Court **ORDERS** that any party seeking to object to this Report and Recommendation file specific written objections within fourteen (14) days of the date on which this Report and Recommendation is entered. Any objections asserting that the Magistrate Judge failed to address any contention raised in the Complaint must also be included. Failure to do so will bar any later challenge or review of the factual findings or legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). A copy of the objections must be served upon all other parties to the action. The filing of objections is not a proper vehicle through which to make new allegations or present additional evidence.

Upon receipt of Objections meeting the specificity requirement set out above, a United States District Judge will make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report, proposed findings, or recommendation to which objection is made and may accept, reject, or modify in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. Objections not meeting the specificity requirement set out above will not be considered by a District Judge. A party may not appeal a Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation directly to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Appeals may be made only from a final judgment entered by or at the direction of a District Judge. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to serve a copy of this Report and Recommendation upon the Plaintiff.

**SO ORDERED** and **REPORTED** and **RECOMMENDED**, this 26th day of February, 2016.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. Stan Baker".

---

R. STAN BAKER  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA